

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Daniel McNeil, Jr.,)	C/A No. 4:07-3000-TLW-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Report and Recommendation
)	
Jay Hodge, Solicitor;)	
Denise M. Gardner Ross; and)	
James Lee Johnson,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Background of this Case

The plaintiff is a pre-trial detainee at the Darlington County Detention Center. The “lead” defendant is the Solicitor for the Fourth Judicial Circuit, which includes Darlington County. Denise M. Gardner Ross and James Lee Johnson are private citizens who have accused the plaintiff of criminal activity. Since the plaintiff provides General Sessions case numbers (07-GS-16-591 and 07-GS-16-592), it appears that the plaintiff has been indicted. The plaintiff alleges that the two private citizens attacked him, attempted to kill him, and have falsely accused him. The plaintiff seeks \$2,500,000 in damages for pain and suffering and for defamation of character. The plaintiff also seeks criminal charges against the two private citizens.

Discussion

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review¹ has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915, 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-325 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995)(*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1177 (1996); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979) (recognizing the district court's authority to conduct an initial screening of any *pro se* filing);² *Loe v. Armistead*, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*, *Moffitt v. Loe*, 446 U.S. 928 (1980); and *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, *Leeke v. Gordon*, 439 U.S. 970 (1978). The plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant, and thus his pleadings are accorded liberal construction. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, ____ U.S. ___, 75 U.S.L.W. 3643, 167 L.Ed.2d 1081, 127 S.Ct. 2197 (2007)(*per curiam*); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9-10 & n. 7 (1980)(*per curiam*); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint or petition, the plaintiff's or petitioner's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). Even under this less stringent standard, the § 1983 complaint is subject to summary

¹Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (DSC), the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

²*Boyce* has been held by some authorities to have been abrogated in part, on other grounds, by *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989)(insofar as *Neitzke* establishes that a complaint that fails to state a claim, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), does not by definition merit *sua sponte* dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) [formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)], as “frivolous”).

dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Although the holding in *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), is not applicable to the above-captioned case, *see Wallace v. Kato*, 166 L.Ed.2d 973, 127 S.Ct. 1091 (2007), the above-captioned case is still subject to summary dismissal. Absent extraordinary circumstances, federal courts are not authorized to interfere with a State's pending criminal proceedings. *See, e.g.*, *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 44 (1971); *Harkrader v. Wadley*, 172 U.S. 148, 169-170 (1898); *Taylor v. Taintor*, 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 366, 370 & n. 8 (1873);³ *Nivens v. Gilchrist*, 319 F.3d 151 (4th Cir. 2003); and *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, 887 F.2d 49, 50-53 (4th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 494 U.S. 1030 (1990). In *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ruled that federal district courts should abstain from constitutional challenges to state judicial proceedings, no matter how meritorious, if the federal claims have been or could be presented in an ongoing state judicial proceeding. *Cinema Blue of Charlotte, Inc. v. Gilchrist, supra*, 887 F.2d at 52. Moreover, the Anti-Injunction Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2283, expressly prohibits this court from enjoining such proceedings. *See also Bonner v. Circuit Court of St. Louis*, 526 F.2d 1331, 1336 (8th Cir. 1975)(*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 424 U.S. 946 (1976).

In *Bonner v. Circuit Court of St. Louis*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit pointed out that federal constitutional claims are cognizable in both state courts and in federal

³ Although the Supreme Court of the United States has not overruled *Taylor v. Taintor*, an unrelated portion of the decision in *Taylor v. Taintor*, which concerned the right of sureties to apprehend principals, has been superannuated by statute in Texas. *See Green v. State*, 829 S.W.2d 222, 223 (Tex. Crim. App. 1992) ("However, *Taylor* is not the law in Texas."), *affirming Green v. State*, 785 S.W.2d 955 (Tex. App. Fort Worth 1990).

courts: "Congress and the federal courts have consistently recognized that federal courts should permit state courts to try state cases, and that, where constitutional issues arise, state court judges are fully competent to handle them subject to Supreme Court review." The *pro se* plaintiff also does not meet the tests for a preliminary injunction or temporary restraining order enunciated in such cases as *North Carolina State Ports Authority v. Dart Containerline Company*, 592 F.2d 749, 750-753 & n. 3 (4th Cir. 1979).

Insofar as his actions in the plaintiff's criminal case are concerned, Solicitor Jay Hodge is immune from suit. In South Carolina, regional prosecutors are called Solicitors and Assistant Solicitors. *See* § 24 of Article V, Constitution of the State of South Carolina; and § 1-7-310, South Carolina Code of Laws. Solicitors are elected by voters of a judicial circuit. Prosecutors, such as Solicitor Hodge, have absolute immunity for activities in or connected with judicial proceedings, such as a criminal trial, bond hearings, bond hearings, bail hearings, grand jury proceedings, and pre-trial "motions" hearings. *See Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259 (1993); *Burns v. Reed*, 500 U.S. 478 (1991); and *Dababnah v. Keller-Burnside*, 208 F.3d 467 (4th Cir. 2000). Moreover, prosecutorial immunity will extend to the direct appeal and the post-conviction case. *See Bruce v. Wade*, 537 F.2d 850, 852 (5th Cir. 1976), where the Court concluded that an attorney representing a government in a habeas corpus or post-conviction case has absolute prosecutorial immunity; and *Henzel v. Gerstein*, 608 F.2d 654, 657 (5th Cir. 1979) (prosecutorial immunity extends to appeals). Cf. *Lowe v. Letsinger*, 772 F.2d 308, 314-315 & n. 7 (7th Cir. 1985); and *Houston v. Partee*, 978 F.2d 362, 365-369 & nn. 3-4 (7th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, *Partee v. Houston*, 507 U.S. 1005 (1993).

Denise M. Gardner Ross and James Lee Johnson are the private citizens who have accused the plaintiff of the crimes for which is currently confined pending trial. Denise M. Gardner Ross and

James Lee Johnson cannot be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for their testimony in the plaintiff's criminal case. In this judicial circuit, it is well settled that a witness in a state court proceeding cannot be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because a witness does not act under color of state law, which is a jurisdictional requirement for a § 1983 suit. *Burke v. Miller*, 580 F.2d 108, 109-110 & n. 3 (4th Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*, 440 U.S. 930 (1979). Moreover, all persons who testified in any judicial proceedings relating to the plaintiff's case have absolute immunity in an action for damages brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Briscoe v. LaHue*, 460 U.S. 325, 327-346 (1983); and *Lowman v. Town of Concord*, 1995 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 3041, 1995 WESTLAW® 108224 (W.D.N.Y., March 7, 1995) (collecting cases). Moreover, their accusations do not constitute action under color of state law because it is well settled that "a private person does not act under color of state law simply because he invokes state authority." *Brummett v. Camble*, 946 F.2d 1178, 1184 (5th Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, *Campbell v. Brummett*, 504 U.S. 965 (1992).⁴

The plaintiff is not entitled to a federal criminal investigation of the defendants or federal criminal charges against the defendants. *See Linda R. S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614, 619 (1973) (a private citizen does not have a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or non-prosecution of another person); *Diamond v. Charles*, 476 U.S. 54, 64-65 (1986) (*applying Linda R. S. v. Richard D.* and collecting cases); *Doyle v. Oklahoma State Bar Ass'n*, 998 F.2d 1559, 1566-1567 (10th Cir. 1993); *Lane v. Correll*, 434 F.2d 598, 600 (5th Cir. 1970); *Nader v. Saxbe*, 162 U.S.App.D.C. 89, 497 F.2d 676, 679 nn. 18-19, 681 n. 27 (D.C.Cir. 1974) (n. 27: "Thus her [Linda R. S.'s] complaint in effect sought a judicial order compelling prosecution of a particular individual, a practice shunned by American courts."); and *United States v. Passman*, 465 F. Supp. 736, 741 & n. 13 (W.D.La.

⁴In this citation, there are variant spellings of the party known as Camble or Campbell.

1979) ("the defendant lacks standing to challenge the failure of the government to instigate criminal proceedings against another person."). *See also Collins v. Palczewski*, 841 F. Supp. 333, 340 (D. Nev. 1993) ("Long ago the courts of these United States established that 'criminal statutes cannot be enforced by civil actions.'"). In other words, there is no constitutional right for a private citizen to have someone criminally prosecuted. *Sattler v. Johnson*, 857 F.2d 224, 227 (4th Cir. 1988), which is cited in *Wells v. Prosecutor Miriani*, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS® 23888, 2005 WESTLAW® 2663041 (D. Conn., October 12, 2005). Furthermore, since the plaintiff does not have a judicially cognizable interest in the criminal prosecution of another person, the plaintiff lacks standing to raise such a claim. *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. at 619.

In this civil rights action, the plaintiff cannot obtain damages for defamation. An alleged act of defamation of character or injury to reputation is not actionable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Paul v. Davis*, 424 U.S. 693, 697-710 & nn. 3-4 (1976). Secondly, under longstanding South Carolina case law, contents of governmental records – such as judicial proceedings, case reports, published cases, investigative reports, or arrest records – do not give rise to liability for slander or libel. *See Heyward v. Cuthbert*, 15 S.C.L. (4 McCord) 354, 356-359 (1827); and *Padgett v. Sun News*, 278 S.C. 26, 292 S.E.2d 30, 32-33 (1982). *See also* case law interpreting the "fair report" doctrine (press may publish a "fair report" on official government proceedings such as arrest records, court records, or transcripts, even if the contents of those governmental records are defamatory), such as, *e.g.*, *Medico v. Time, Inc.*, 643 F.2d 134, 137-140 (3rd Cir.), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 836 (1981), where the Court held that a news magazine was privileged to publish a summary of FBI documents identifying the appellant as a member of an organized crime group; *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469 (1975)(prohibiting invasion of privacy action for publication of public record – name of deceased

rape victim); and *Lee v. Dong-A Ilbo*, 849 F.2d 876, 878-880 & nn. 1-2 (4th Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, *Dong-A Ilbo v. Lee*, 489 U.S. 1067 (1989). Furthermore, civil rights statutes, such as 42 U.S.C. § 1983, do not impose liability for violations of duties of care arising under a state's tort law. *DeShaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services*, 489 U.S. 189 (1989).

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. *See Denton v. Hernandez; Neitzke v. Williams; Haines v. Kerner; Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 & n. * (4th Cir. 1993), replacing unpublished opinion originally tabled at 993 F.2d 1535 (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh; Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d at 74; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) [essentially a redesignation of "old" 1915(d)]; and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A [as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal]. The plaintiff's attention is directed to the Notice on the next page.

September 11, 2007
Florence, South Carolina

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The plaintiff is advised that he may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. **Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court judge need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in a waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, *Schronce v. United States*, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); and *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).